DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 417 383 CS 013 110

AUTHOR Keating, Patricia R.

TITLE Phonics or Whole Language, Which Is the Better Way To Teach Our Children?

PUB DATE 1998-05-00

NOTE 35p.; M.A. Research Project, Kean University.

PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Reports - Research (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Grade 2; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Phonics; Primary Education; Reading Comprehension; Tables (Data); Vocabulary Development; *Whole Language Approach; Word Recognition

IDENTIFIERS California Achievement Tests; Teaching Research

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of whole language versus phonics on reading achievement. Four second-grade students participated--two were chosen for a control sample in which they were taught using the modified whole language approach; and two were chosen for the experimental sample and were taught using the modified whole language approach plus additional phonics skills. The students were given a pretest and a posttest, which tested vocabulary, comprehension, word analysis, and word identification. Results indicated no significant difference in vocabulary, comprehension, and word identification, but a significant difference for word analysis. Findings suggest how these results may be influenced by different teaching strategies. (Contains 27 references and 6 tables of data; an appendix contains additional data.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 417 383

Phonics or Whole Language, Which is the Better Way to Teach Our Children?

by
Patricia R. Keating

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Master of Arts Degree

Kean University of New Jersey

May 1998

CS013110

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Keating
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of whole language versus phonics on reading achievement. Four students participated in the study. Two students were chosen for a control sample, in which they were taught using the modified whole language approach. Two students were chosen for the experimental sample. They were taught using the modified whole language approach plus additional phonics skills. The students were given a pretest and a posttest, which tested: vocabulary, comprehension, word analysis and word identification. The results indicated that there was no significant difference in vocabulary, comprehension and word identification. There was a significant difference of .05 for word analysis. The paper concludes with a discussion of how these results may be influenced by different teaching strategies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Albert J. Mazurkiewicz. His instruction, guidance and encouragement throughout this final phase of the Masters Program, allowed me to remain focused and confident that I would reach my goal.

DEDICATION

To my wonderful husband, Kevin with a world of gratitude and appreciation for his many hours of typing this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page No.
I. Abstract	i
II. Acknowledgments	ii
III. Dedication	iii
IV. List of Tables	iv
V. Title	
Introduction	1-2
Hypothesis	3
Procedure	3-4
Results and Discussion	4-10
VI. Title: Related Literature	11-20
VII. Bibliography	21-23
VIII. Appendix	24-26

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIST OF TABLES

	Page No.
I. Mean, Standard Deviation and t Test Results of Vocabulary Pretest	5
II. Mean, Standard Deviation and t Test Results of Vocabulary Posttest	5
III. Mean, Standard Deviation and t Test Results of Comprehension Pretest	6
IV. Mean, Standard Deviation and t Test Results of Comprehension Posttest	7
V. Mean, Standard Deviation and t Test Results of Word Analysis	7
VI. Mean, Standard Deviation and t Test Results of Word Identification	8

People have been searching for the single best way to teach children to read for more then a century. The "look-say" reading method held sway for about 30 years (1940-1970) before the pendulum swung to phonics, which as popular for about twenty-years (1970-1990) before whole language, another form of look-say, gained a strong foothold. An extensive body of research on reading styles supports the global approach of whole language as a frame work for teaching young children and poor readers, but only as a framework. The strategies within that framework depend on the reading styles of the particular students in the group. Every reading approach demands certain reading style strengths.

There are advantages for remedial children in a whole-language classroom. They can choose books on their own reading level. They can read material that interests them.

Traditional structure in which everyone is assigned a reading group dissolves into a more flexible organization, and remedial students are no longer permanently assigned to the academic underclass . Retreat from strict ability grouping has exposed many "low -ability" children to activities that used to be reserved for the "gifted", and has helped students of all abilities discover hidden strengths. As one might expect, motivation is high.

The difficulty with the whole-language classroom is that is filled with opportunities for the remedial child to get lost in the shuffle. Distractible children who have trouble staying on task may not do well in the less structured atmosphere.

All children need help at times; remedial children need help more often. When understanding breaks down, it is up to the teacher to do whatever is necessary to get the child back on track. This may mean modeling a procedure again.

Poor readers can be taught to use strategies. They can learn pre-reading strategies that activate prior knowledge and repair strategies that clarify information or unlock unknown words (Duffy and Roehler, 1987). They can be trained to integrate new knowledge with prior knowledge and make inferences while they read (Pearson and Dole, 1987). In the future, we will surely identify even more strategies and spare them with poor readers.

The current movement toward whole language is also a movement away from phonics. The results of this study raise serious questions about the wisdom of that trend. Educators who support phonics instruction have often been labeled anti-whole language. The following statement by Jeanne Chall (1989) reveals some frustration with that attitude. "Currently, the anti-phonics movement has taken unto itself a pro-literature, pro-writing, and pro-thinking stance, as if those who teach phonics and decoding are opposed to these obviously excellent aims". Can educators be true to whole language and still advocate the teaching of phonics to young children? The results of this study would suggest that they can if phonics instruction is viewed in proper perspective with other classroom practices relevant to literacy development. It would be ludicrous to suggest that teachers support the misguided "skill and drill" program rejected by whole language enthusiasts. However, there does seem to be room in phonics in the whole language camp.

Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that underachievers at the second grade level who have been taught using a phonics emphasis or whole language approach, will show no difference in their reading performance as measured by the California Achievement Test.

Procedure

Four students in a second grade class, who were identified as under achievers, were chosen to participate in this study. All four students were below grade level in their reading ability. Reading Achievement prior and after the experiment was assessed using the California Achievement Test, consisting of vocabulary, comprehension and word analysis. Word identification was assessed prior and after the experiment using the Dolch sight word list of 220 words.

Two students were randomly assigned to the control sample. They were taught using the modified whole language approach which consisted of an integration of the teaching of writing, spelling, listening and reading into one language approach, the use of children's literature containing themes and topics of interest for children, and the use of intrinsic motivation to stimulate student involvement. Student interaction was engaged by providing opportunities for students to work together on common interests and goals.

Student centered holistic reading and writing activities were used. Two periods of a systematic phonic lesson were used on a weekly basis totaling one hour and a half.

Two students were also assigned to the experimental sample. They were taught using the modified whole language approach. The students were taught phonics outlined in the Haughton Mifflin Program for thirty minutes each day. The students had fifteen minutes daily of tutoring in either oral reading or skill reinforcement. The students were rewarded for progress in their reading ability.

Results

Students involved in the modified whole language program with additional phonics approach made greater vocabulary gain, comprehension gains, word analysis gains and total reading gains than students involved in the modified whole language approach. To test for significant achievement differences due to treatment, a student's t was computed for each variable using the reading pretest and posttest.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations and t of the Samples' of Vocabulary Pretest

Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Control	65.75	7.78	1.23
Experimental	63.95	19.09	

NS

Table one shows the vocabulary data from the California Achievement Pretest. The control sample had a mean score which was almost two points higher than the experimental sample. The difference was not significant.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations and t of the Samples' of Vocabulary Posttest

Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Control	66.30	12.78	0.83
Experimental	64.95	19.09	

NS

The data in table two shows the California Achievement Posttests results on vocabulary, and though the control sample had a 1. 35 point greater mean, this difference was found to be non-significant.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations and t of the Samples' of Comprehension Pretest

Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Control	23	2.83	0.95
Experimental	17	8.49	

NS

Table three shows the results of the comprehension subtest from the pretest using the California Achievement Test. While there was a six point difference between the samples, the difference is not significant.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations and t of the Samples' of Comprehension Posttest

Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Control	25.50	2.12	0.28
Experimental	24.50	7.07	

NS

Table four indicates the non-significant results of the comprehension subtest from the posttest using the California Achievement Test. When the data in table three and four are compared, it can be seen that the experimental sample made a greater mean gain from pretest to posttest (8.5 points vs. 2.5 points) but this difference was found to be non-significant.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations and t of the Samples' of Word Analysis

Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Control	2.50	0.71	4.02
Experimental	7.00	1.41	

SIG. AT .056

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table five indicates the results of word analysis with the control group mean being 2.50 and the experimental group mean at 7.00, the five point difference was just barely significant.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations and t of the Samples' of Word Identification

Sample	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Control	17.50	3.54	0.62
Experimental	30.00	28.28	

NS

Table six indicates the results of word identification test. There was a 12.50 point difference between the samples. The difference was not significant.

Discussion

The hypothesis of the study was that underachievers at the second grade level who have been taught using a phonics emphasis or whole language approach, will show no difference in their reading performance as measured by the California Achievement Test. The results of this study

indicate that this was not true and therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. However, when treated for statistical significance, the differences were found to be non-significant.

The four students selected for comparison in this study are a fraction of the second graders in the school. The sample's results can not be used to generalize about all second grade students.

It should be recognized however that adequate time and practice of phonics based strategies incorporated within a whole language modified approach does enhance the skills of a second grader under achiever.

Conclusion

The way we conceive of the causes of a particular problem at any given historical moment influences how we seek to solve that problem. Whole language even though modified will not by itself make everyone literate, nor will direct teaching of skills or strategies. This research identifies using techniques which provide students with plenty of good literature and content reading material and great a supportive, cooperative atmosphere in which students work with and learn from other students, especially in the skills and strategies approach. With this we apparently can make school a more

productive and joyful place for everyone.

However additional research with a larger sample and a longer period of instruction should be conducted to determine whether these initial findings can be supported and generalizable.

RELATED RESEARCH

The term whole language has excited, angered and confused, many during the past fifteen-years. One reason for the varied reactions is the vagueness of its definition. Altwerger, Edelsky, and Flores (1987) explained that whole language is "an overriding theory and point of view about language, literacy, and content learning". Instead of being a particular set of materials or a program for teaching reading, "Whole language means different things to different people but it does have generic principals" (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1990). Vagueness is problematic because it leaves many wondering exactly what specific beliefs whole language teachers really have. Regie Routman (1991), describes whole language teachers as being knowledgeable about literacy issues and as integrating the language arts rather then separating them. She explains that whole language teachers use authentic materials and methods and that they teach language from whole parts.

Behaviorism is an intellectual movement with philosophical roots in scientific realism (Dembo, 1988). American psychologist John B. Watson (1959) claimed that all human behavior is the result of stimuli and responses to them. It was B.F. Skinner who first advanced it (Skinner, 1953). Skinner concluded that behavior which is reinforcement persists. "Any behavior can be analyzed in terms of its reinforcement history" (Dembo, 1988).

From a behaviorlistic standpoint, classroom teachers are the main reinforcement of student behavior, and as a result play a large role in shaping it. The teachers goal is the desire to establish a learning environment that

maximizes the possibility that students will receive the reinforcement they need. Gough (1985) and LaBerge and Samuels (1985) have proposed models of reading that stem from behaviorlistic thought. Those skills models of reading argue that meaning lies in the text and that the reader must decode the author's written message into oral language in order to comprehend. These teachers use controlled reading materials and formally assess student progress. The classroom is usually isolated from the outside involvement, institutional in its arraignment, and fragmented in its curriculum (Reutzel and Cooter, 1996).

Though Rouseau is considered by many to be the father of humanism or progressivism, American educator John Dewey was a strong proponent in furthering this philosophy in the United States. In the progressive view, nature is in a constant state of flux, and the mind is a tool for problem solving rather than a vessel to be filled with knowledge. The major focus of the learning process is the learner, "teaching and learning are more meaningful and personal" (Dembo, 1988) than in behaviorlistic philosophy. Carl Rogers (1969), a humanistic psychologist views the teacher as the facilitator for learning, The teacher shares responsibility with students for the learning process. Emphasis on authentic materials and activities is a hallmark of a progressive or humanistic classroom (Rogers, 1969). The open education movement of the 1970s, with its emphasis on practical hands on activities, teacher respect for students, and student self-direction and self-evaluation, is the result of humanistic thought. Also related to progressivism include cooperative learning, Reality Therapy (Glasser, 1965) and Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET) (Gorden, 1974). Humanistic principles include;

Student self-regulation and self-control, cooperation instead of competition, and teacher-student shared responsibility for learning. Classrooms from a progressive tradition stress authenticity of materials and methods in language arts instruction. Students are encouraged to search for meaning and to become self-initiated learners. The overriding goal is that learning in such

classrooms is not forced, but is more natural (Reutzel and Cooter, 1996). The reader brings the reading process understanding about the nature of language and the social uses to create meaning, using a variety of sources both in and out of text. Teachers emphasize process of comprehension rather than the form of language. Less emphasis is placed on oral reading accuracy, spelling conventions, grammar usage, and letter sound relationships. Students learning to read and write by actually reading and writing, with skills taught in meaningful contexts as required.

A variety of standardized readiness and early reading tests (Hodges, 1989) found that many test have stayed the same for virtually sixty years. These tests reflect a behavioral approach that assumes that literacy can only be taught through the direct instruction of isolated skills which are hierarchically organized and mastered one level at a time. Such tests are inappropriate for literacy assessment based, on a holistic philosophy because they measure only reading skills and ignore other components of literacy such as speaking, listening, and writing-components that are correlated with stress in reading. Even in the area of reading these tests measure only a narrow range of the knowledge and skills involved.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The current emphasis on whole language may have helped to raise the recurring debate between meaning-based (whole language) and phonics-based (code emphasis) approaches to teaching reading (Morris, 1989). Chall (1989) has noted a "resemblance of the 'whole language' approach to the whole-word', 'sight', and 'thought' approaches from the 1920s through the late 1960's. By linking whole language with whole word, Chall has intentionally or unintentionally resurrected the old issue of a meaning-emphasis approach versus a code-emphasis approach.

Many at risk readers have not gained much confidence in themselves as readers. They doubt their abilities and are afraid to take risks. They frequently have reservations about the professionals who want to help them strengthen their reading. They need a positive learning environment (Helmstetter, 1987). A teacher's faith in them enables them to have faith in themselves. The result is often a renewed effort to try.

There is no single cause that explains reading problems, although there are certain traits commonly found. Short attention span, poor organization skills, and problems processing information are typical. Some have a limited language base others have no exposure to print before coming to school. When these problems lead to academic failure, self-esteem is damaged, creating another set of learning difficulties.

Whole language, a movement that supported good literature and integrated curricula and shrinks in horror from isolated skills and workbooks, is partially rooted in Piaget's constructivist theory of learning (Poplin, 1988). Constructivists define learning in general and reading comprehension in

particular as a process of constructing meanings by integrating new information into old schemes (Furth, 1970). The constructivists's belief that their mind is a place where all the knowledge is integrated within the mental schemes suggests that the meaning of any word, story, or fact varies from learner to learner because each learner works with a unique set of schemes. Building oral background and relevant vocabulary is a process.

In a whole-language classes, all children are exposed to extensive pre-reading activities that help then access what they know, fill in the necessary gaps, and connect the content of the selection to their own lives. K-W-L, a three step process; a. determine what they know, b. decide what they want to find out and c. acknowledge what they learned (Ogle, 1986). When a class builds background together, children can learn from each other, and everyone approaches the learning task on more equal footing. Research shows comprehension to be less dependent on students' reading ability than on their knowledge about a topic and understanding of key vocabulary (Pearson, 1985). A teacher can prepare remedial students during pre-reading time to function more capably with other classmates. A general scheme is story structure (Carine and Kinder, 1985). Stories in our culture have beginnings, middles and ends. They have plots, themes, settings and character elements that relate to each other in predictable ways. Another strategy is reading aloud everyday, asking students to predict things about the story. Have students summarize, retell and relate the story to their own lives. Visual diagrams are also useful. Many teachers encourage students to use systematic strategies such as Q3R, developed by Robinson as long ago as 1941

(Robinson, 1941). This strategy and similar ones have been described by Reynolds and Salend (1990).

Skills people, also known as reductionists because they reduce all learning to small steps, believe we should continue to teach skills: based on Bloom's (18974) theory of mastery learning, skills approaches emphasize on clear, sequenced objectives, ongoing evaluation, and immediate feedback. Reductionists believe that by mastering each skill, a learner will master the whole. Findings from many studies show the value of presenting material in small steps, giving students an opportunity for guided practice, and providing systematic feedback and corrections. Research shows that automaticity in basic skills, achieved through drill and practice, is a necessary prerequisite for complex, creative cognitive tasks.

For years many publishers and educators, in their zeal to ferret out every skill and teach it well, forgot the goal of all the skills and all the worksheets was to teach children to be able to read a book and like it. Drill replaced reading, which caused the confusion among instruction, practice, and assessment (Durkin, 1984). In most basal manuals, the instructional portion of any lesson looked a lot like a quiz, and children who did not know the answers did not get a lot of help. They just practiced endlessly the skills they could not do.

Holistic theorists said that any isolation of skills was inappropriate. Teach reading holistically, they exhorted, and students will construct meaning by integrating new ideas with established schemes. Students will invent their own sound system while reading whole texts; it was not necessary to teach phonics systematically (Goodman, 1989).

Adams concluded that we need to teach the symbol-sound system explicitly and early and noted that it was a "singularly successful mode of teaching young or slow learners to read". Adams, Chall and Brophy have found that comprehension depends on the ability to thoroughly recognize words quickly and automatically.

Many remedial readers have problems with decoding print. They do not learn phonics easily, and when they turn to connected print they have difficulty with comprehension, because they are not able to read the words they must expend so much effort on decoding that they lose the sense of what they are reading.

The answer is to combine the insights of the skills people with the insights from the whole-language people. Providing practice with explicit phonics as well as a lot of experience in reading whole texts. Unfortunately, context clues can be misleading, and the more likely the guess will be wrong. Children must be trained to work with both context and letter sounds.

There are advantages to remedial children in a whole-language classroom. They can choose their own books. They share ideas in response journals like other students, and they share ideas in response groups with children of all ability levels.

The difficulty with the whole language classroom is that it is filled with opportunities for the remedial child to get lost in the shuffle. Distractible children who have trouble staying on task may not do well in the less structured atmosphere.

The difference between a strategy and a skill is that strategies taught as a conscious plan of action to be used during the process of reading. Whereas

skills were traditionally taught to discrete activities that need to be applied to reading.

Poor readers can learn pre-reading strategies that activate prior knowledge and repair strategies that clarify information or unlock unknown words (Duffy and Roehler, 1989). They can be trained to integrate new knowledge with prior knowledge and make inferences while they read (Pearson and Dole, 1987). Passive readers often do not realize that they do not understand what they are reading.

Davey (1983) suggested that teachers model the cognitive processes of reading by thinking aloud about a reading selection.

Choral responding (Heward, Courson and Narayan, 1989) and hands on activities that involve the tactile and kinesthetic modalities help students to become better learners (Carbo, 1987). A solution to competition is to encourage group activities (Cohen, 1986). Most children like to work together, so motivation is high. Students teach each other, they develop self-confidence and independence, a process called cooperative learning (Johnson and Johnson, 1990).

Children have to be taught how to work together. They must learn such basic social skills as being encouraging, criticizing ideas without criticizing people, and resolving conflicts constructively. These social skills must be taught explicitly and evaluated as carefully as content objectives (Madden, 1988).

The "whole language" movement is the most discussed trend in language arts education today. According to Goodman (1986) "a whole language program is an educational program conducted by whole language teachers".

Rich (1985) describes whole language as " an attitude of mind which provides a shape for the classroom". Farris and Kaczmarsk; admitted the framework of hole language tends to be quite abstract, dealing primarily with attitudes and beliefs (1988).

Children seem to enjoy and learn from whole language. Whole language teachers integrate the teaching of the language arts into a single period. They recognize the inter-relatedness of reading, writing, speaking and listening. Whole language teachers encourage students to write as soon as they enter school. Literature books are widely used in whole language classrooms. The best children's literature available to teachers are read to and with children. Teachers use stories containing "natural text" and predictable language patterns. The literature instruction is organized around themes or units of study that are of interest to students. Children read and write about these special topics or themes. Whole language advocated claim that when children are given opportunities to enjoy good literature, create stories, write letters, keep personal journals, and share their written products with others, language learning becomes rewarding social interaction is essential and visible.

Whole language advocates do not teach skills in isolation, especially phonics skills. They believe that skills instruction should grow out of holistic language experiences, based upon students recognizable needs.

The National Commission on reading believes that phonics knowledge improves word recognition abilities, and that fast, accurate word recognition, in turn, is needed for effective reading comprehension (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott and Wilkinson, 1985). Phonics instruction may help students "sound out" words understood at the aural level, but unrecognized in print. A major

goal of explicit phonics instruction is to teach students how to segment and blend sounds in words. Decoding at the "sounding out" level substantially interrupts the comprehension process, it has been suggested that words accessed in this manner are remembered better than when using the more rapid identification process or contextual analysis (Adam, 1990). Phonics instruction may help students learn the regular grapho phonic patterns within words which facilitates word recognition growth. A knowledge of the grapho phonic patterns found in printed words-an outcome associated with explicit phonics instruction (Dank, 1976) may be the critical factor influencing word recognition growth and word recognition speed. Words are processed as perceptual patterns; they are read as whole units rather than letter by letter (Cattell, 1886). Phonics instruction focuses on these patterns. Fox and Routh (1984) found that early learning of phonics skills strongly affected students' later ability to acquire new words. There is evidence suggesting that students learn the graphophonic patterns in words quickly in the early grades when they are taught how to segment and blend sounds in words (Dank, 1976). As young children become acquainted with the principles involved in stringing letters together to form words (orthographic constraints) they use this graphophonic knowledge to learn new words (Fox and Routh, 1989), and to rapidly access familiar words. Inadequate decoding knowledge seems to be a hallmark of poor readers (Carnine, 1984). The ability to use graphophonic cues may be important to beginning readers than was previously supposed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berger, Joseph "Fighting Over Reading (Efforts to Dismiss Furnace Woods Elementary (Cortlandt Manor, N.Y.) Principal J.M. Falinski Over Her Insistence on Whole Language Learning)". New York Times, Pg. B1, November 17, 1993.

Berrybill, Allison "Whatever happened to Dick and Jane?" Better Homes and Gardens Vol. 75, Pg. 50, February 1997.

Bracey, Gerald W. "Standardized Testing, Unstandardized Kids (Research by Kenneth Wodtke and others and by Brian Cambourne and Jan Turbill)". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 71, Pg. 732-733, May 1990.

Bracey, Gerald W. "Whole Lotta Whole Language". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 72, Pg. 79-80, September 1990.

Bracey, Gerald W. "Maybe Not So Much Whole Language". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 72, Pg, 247-248, November 1990.

Bracey, Gerald W. "Whole Language Versus Code Orientation". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 74, Pg. 97-98, September 1992.

Carbo, Marie "'Debunking the Great Phonics Myth (Questioning Work of J. Chall)". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 70, Pg. 226-240, November 1988.

Carbo, Marie "Learning to Read: The Great Debate 20 Years Later-A Response to 'Debunking the Great Phonics Myth'(Discussion of November 1988 Article and March 1989 Articles)". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 70, Pg. 498, 521-38, March 1989.

Carbo, Marie "Whole Language or Phonics? Use Both!". The Education Digest, Vol. 61, Pg. 60-63, February 1996.

Chall, Jeanne Sternlicht "Learning to Read: The Great Debate 20 Years Later-A Response to 'Debunking the Great Phonics Myth'". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 70, Pg. 521-538, March 1989.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dwyer, Victor "Sounding Out Success (Phonics is Superior to Whole Language Approach When Teaching Children to Read; research by Barbara Foorman)" . Macleans Vol. 110 pg. 62 March 3, 1997.

Gold, Judith; Greengrass, Linda and Kulleseid, Eleanor "Whole Language and Teacher/Librarian Partnerships (Children's Literature Response Group at the Bank Street School in NewYork City)". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 73, Pg. 536-537, March 1992.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "I Didn't Found Whole Language; Whole Language Found Me".
The Education Digest, Vol. 50, Pg. 64-67, October 1993.

Harman, Susan and Edelsky, Carole "Literacy Acquisition and Alienation (Whole Language Learning)". The Education Digest, Vol. 55, Pg. 35-39, December 1989.

Harste, Jerome and Lowe, Kaye Staton "Whole Language : Getting the Act Together". The Education Digest, Vol. 57, Pg. 45-49, December 1991.

Lamme, Linda Leonard "Whole-language Instruction: Teaching Authorship". The Education Digest, Vol. 55, Pg. 46-50, November 1989.

Levine, Art "The Great Debate Revisited (Phonics vs. Whole Language Learning)". Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 274, Pg. 38, December 1994.

Lodge, Sally A. "Bob Books Break into the Big Time(B.L. Maslen's Phonics-based Series)". Publishers Weekly, Vol. 241, Pg. 32-33, September 1994.

McConaghy, Tom "Canada: A Leader in Whole Language Instruction". Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 70, Pg. 336-337, December 1988.

Newman, Judith M. and Church, Susan M. "19 Ways to Misread Whole Language". The Education Digest, Vol. 56, Pg. 25-29, April 1991.

Ohanian, Susan "Learning 'Whole Language' ". Publishers Weekly, Vol. 238, Pg. 123-125, February 22, 1991.

Sanacore, Joseph "Whole-language Grouping That Works". The Education Digest, Vol. 58, Pg. 67-70, January 1993.

Thomas, John B. "Teaching Kids to Read: Is Your Child Getting Enough Phonics and Whole Language". Better Homes and Gardens, Vol. 69, Pg. 40, October 1991.

Turner, Richard L. "The 'Great' Debate-Can Both Carbo and Chall be Right?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 71, Pg. 276-283, December 1989.

Weaver, Constance "Weighing the Claims About "Phonics First". The Education Digest, Vol. 56, Pg. 19-22, April 1991.

Vail, Priscilla L. "Watch out for the hole in whole language". The Education Digest, Vol. 56, Pg.23-24, April 1991.

Young, Pamela "The Reading Debate". Maclean's, Vol. 106, Pg. 42-43, January 11, 1993.

APPENDIX

California Achievement Test
Form E, Level 11

PRETEST

Student No.	Number Correct	Scale Score	Combined Score
1.			
VOC.	**26**	**683**	
COM.	**27**	**644**	**663**
2.			
VOC.	**22**	**650**	
COM.	**26**	**657**	**653**
3.			
VOC.	**19**	**628**	
COM.	**17**	**624**	**626**
4.			
VOC.	**24**	**666**	
COM.	**21**	**638**	**652**

POSTTEST

Student No.	Number Correct	Scale Score	Combined Score
1.			
VOC.	**27**	**692**	
COM.	**25**	**653**	**672**
2.			
VOC.	**24**	**666**	
COM.	**27**	**661**	**663**
3.			
VOC.	**21**	**642**	
COM.	**19**	**631**	**636**

4.			
VOC.	**24**	**666**	
COM.	**22**	**642**	**654**

WORD ANALYSIS
PRETEST

Student No.	Number Correct	Scale Score
1.	25	623
2.	23	606
3.	11	516
4.	21	592

WORD ANALYSIS
POSTTEST

Student No.	Number Correct	Scale Score
1.	27	645
2.	29	684
3.	19	579
4.	24	614

Word Identification
Dolch Sight Word List

PRETEST

Student No.	
1.	120

2.	95
3.	40
4.	140

POSTTEST

Student No.

1.	135
2.	105
3.	90
4.	160

BEST COPY AVAILABLE